

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-30 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 12, 20, and 26 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 12, 15-18, 20, 23, and 26 are sought to be amended. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-4, 9, 11-14, 19-22, 24, 26, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,209,101 to Mitchem *et al.* (hereinafter "Mitchem") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,623 to Blakely *et al.* (hereinafter "Blakely"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner states that Mitchem substantially teaches Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Mitchem does not teach or suggest at least the following elements recited in claim 1:

receiving a resource request from a first requestor, *the resource request including credentials* and identifying information regarding an operation to be performed with respect to a resource;

translating the resource request to a resource inquiry request, the resource inquiry request including a resource authorization parameter representing the permission level necessary for a client to perform the operation;

determining whether the first requestor is authorized to perform the operation with respect to the resource based on whether the credentials in the resource request match the resource authorization parameter associated with the resource node.

Mitchem does not teach or suggest “determining whether the first requestor is authorized to perform the operation with respect to the resource based on whether the credentials in the resource request match the resource authorization parameter associated with the resource node.” Instead, Mitchem determines whether a “task” is permitted to invoke the desired operation on the requested resource. *Mitchem*, col. 3, lines 30-44. Mitchem defines a “task” as representing “computational entities such as user applications, mail handlers and proxy servers.” *Mitchem*, col. 3, lines 10-12. Thus, unlike the present invention which determines whether the first requestor is authorized to perform the operation with respect to the resource based on whether the credentials in the resource request match the resource authorization parameter associated with the resource node, Mitchem determines whether the task is permitted to invoke the desired operation on the requested resource. Mitchem also does not teach or suggest credentials.

The Examiner admits, on page 4 of the Office Action, and Applicant agrees, that Mitchem does not disclose “a resource request including credentials”, “translating the resource request to a resource inquiry request, the resource inquiry request including a resource authorization parameter representing the permission [level] necessary for a client to perform the operation”, and “determining the resource request authorization based on whether the credentials in the resource request match the resource authorization parameter associated with the resource node”. The Examiner further states that Blakely discloses these features.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Blakely does not solve all of the deficiencies of Mitchem. For example, Blakely does not teach or suggest at least the following: “translating the resource request to a resource inquiry request, the resource inquiry request including a resource authorization parameter representing the permission level necessary for a client to perform the operation.”

Instead, Blakely teaches mapping the authenticated user id to an id for the enterprise resource to enable obtaining an id authentication token or password. *Blakely*, col. 5, lines 7-13. Thus, contrary to the present invention, the mapping in Blakely results in obtaining an id authentication token or password, not a “resource authorization parameter representing the permission level necessary for a client to perform the operation,” as recited in claim 1.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-11), are patentable over Mitchem and Blakely, separately or in combination.

Independent claims 20 and 26 include similar elements to independent claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, independent claims 20 and 26, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 21-25 and 27-30, respectively), are patentable over Mitchem and Blakely, separately or in combination.

Independent claim 12 includes similar elements to independent claim 1. Furthermore, neither Mitchem nor Blakely teach or suggest Applicant’s element of: “...a resource data structure having resource nodes each of which represents a respective resource and which has a respective resource identifier, a resource authorization credential, and a resource authorization level.” Thus, for at least the reasons stated

above, independent claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 13-19) are also patentable over Mitchem and Blakely, separately or in combination.

Thus, neither Mitchem nor Blakely, separately or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 12, 20, and 26. For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 12, 20, and 26, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-11, 13-19, 21-25, and claims 27-30, respectively), are patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 12, 20, and 26, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-11, 13-19, 21-25, and 27-30, respectively).

The Examiner, on page 10 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 5-8, 15-18, 23, and 27 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,209,101 to Mitchem *et al.* (hereinafter "Mitchem") and U.S. Patent No. 6,067,623 to Blakely *et al.* (hereinafter "Blakely") as applied to claims 1, 12, and 20, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,941,947 to Brown *et al.* (hereinafter "Brown"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 5-8, 15-18, 23, and 27 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 20, and 26, respectively, and are patentable over Mitchem and Blakely for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Brown does not teach or suggest the features missing from Mitchem and Blakely. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 5-8, 15-18, 23, and 27.

The Examiner, on page 11 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 10, 25, and 30 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,209,101 to Mitchem *et al.* (hereinafter "Mitchem") and U.S. Patent No. 6,067,623 to Blakely *et al.* (hereinafter

“Blakely”) as applied to claims 9 and 20, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,171 to Carter *et al.* (hereinafter “Carter”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 10, 25, and 30 depend from independent claims 1, 20, and 26, respectively, and are patentable over Mitchem and Blakely for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Carter does not teach or suggest the features missing from Mitchem and Blakely. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 10, 25, and 30.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: January 29, 2006

/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(202) 986-3179

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026